Clark County Environmental Services

2013-2018 NPDES Stormwater Permit
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE #10

Wednesday, May 20, 2015
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Public Service Center, 6th Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin St.

Attendees (invited):	~~Don Benton, Jeff Schnabel~~, Rod Swanson, Jane Tesner Kleiner, Fereidoon Safdari	Clark County - DES
	Ali Safayi, John Davis	Clark County – Public Works
	~~Gordy Euler~~	Clark County - Planning
	~~Jan Bazala, Jim Muir, Bryan Mattson~~	Clark County – Comm. Dev.
	Eric Golemo	SGA Engineering
	~~Andrew Gunther~~	PLS Engineering
	~~Dick Rylander, David Meyer~~	Clean Water Comm.
	John Meier	AKS Engineering
	~~Peter Tuck~~	Olson Engineering
	~~Jon Girod~~	Quail Homes
	~~Troy Johns~~	Urban NW Homes
	Lance Lehto	Columbia West
	~~Alex Zimmerman~~	Creative Courses
	~~Robin Krause~~	CRWD
	Annette Griffy	City of Vancouver
	Tim Kraft & Trista Kobluskie (consultant for manual update)	OTAK

Agenda Topics:

3:00	**1. Welcome**	Clark County staff
3:05	**2. Design Manual Policy Issues – wrap up from last meeting**	Rod and all
3:45	**3. Ecology response to Review Draft (June 2014)**	Rod and all
4:30	**5. Next steps** • **Public process – documents will be reviewed at public meetings (CWC, DEAB, Planning Commission, BOCC)** • **Schedule** • **Adoption target and make effective (by January 8, 2016)**	Jane Tesner Kleiner

NOTES: (see summary below)

MEETING SUMMARY (items that require follow-up are marked with a ☐)

Design Manual Policy (recap of notes from last meeting)

- On a site itself, the city has a policy for corner lot development to use stormwater (SW) treatment for frontage as opposed to treatment for both roads (create efficient and cost effective location of SW treatment). Most road frontages are actually built by private development so it is an important point to consider: what is the requirement for treatment? The DOE manual has language to address this issue. In the Review Draft of the Clark County Stormwater Manual Chapter 1, page 13 (only in the redevelopment section) addresses this issue. Note from Rod: Appendix 1 of the permit allows moving compliance with minimum requirements to surfaces on the site that are not new development, replaced or converted. This only applies to redevelopment. The allowance applies to public road projects that drain to the same receiving water.
- Rod reviewed the policy paper from January TAC meeting: 1) applicability of permit MR's to areas not draining to MS4….same standard for all areas; 2) Public / private SW facility ownership will stay the same; 3) Economic infeasibility will not move forward; 4) Bioretention facility setbacks – staff is still working on finalizing that issue; 5) Lot plans – we may want to address with vesting question – the vesting issue is still under appeal but county will add clarifying language (any project with application (which includes a SEPA and site plan submittal) before July 1, 2015 with no construction before July 1, 2020; 6) permeable pavement can be used for local roads under 400 ADT;
- Transportation related code – The county reviewed all code for LID barriers, including road standards and the County decided to hold off on those due to the recent updates to road standards. Eric suggested changes to the road standards for shed sections in a roadway, especially on local roads, as it is cheaper to change out bioretention in the future as opposed to pervious pavement, if you can meet the performance standard.

Ecology response to the Review Draft – (Rod) Delay in DOE review (received in April 2015) caused a change in the overall schedule. DOE review provided 108 comments, most of which are edits for consistencies and alignment to the 2014 amendment to the permit/SWMMWW. The County will send out the Ecology comments to TAC members.

- The County has prepared comments on the Ecology letter and comment matrix to direct Otak for the manual updates.
-
- For example, WSDOT highway manual has a separate process for infeasibility so Clark County needs reference its specific criteria.
- Also, MR#8 for wetlands had several comments.
- Also, we will group the applicability, limitations, etc. into one section to increase customer usability, similar to Ecology's manual.
- Another comment, DOE wants October 1 – April 1st per the 2014 SWMMWW for the wet season groundwater monitoring (which is at the actual wet season but is a poor time to monitor groundwater depth, which is why we picked January through May).
- Phosphorus controls (Clark County relies on a Lacamas Lake study).
- Infiltration testing same from 2009 so that does not change.

- ☐ **Groundwater (GW) monitoring studies**, data is available for groundwater contours. GIS data is good for planning but not necessarily design. Ecology requires 15' depth of data therefore 25' should create sufficient coverage assuming the depth to water contours are accurate to 10 feet. There are some ambiguities to the language on GW monitoring and subjectivity. Ali, Lance, and Eric suggest that the language can be clarified. Not sure when some of the data was measured and if it is current. Data can be ± 10 feet. John asked if a neighboring project could use data….there are numerous (20+) of piezometers all over the county so there is a good amount of data available. The problem is getting the geotech reports in older stormwater design submittals Need to review language to confirm use of data per each site. Drilled wells are submitted to DOE. Timing of GW monitoring could add delay to a project given the status of the project development……can make ground water study a conditional approval requirement (Development Engineering does not deny any preliminary design because of GW monitoring).

- ☐ **Infiltration setbacks for external flow**……current code says it needs a 10' setback from external property line. Example, use of a gravel trench along the perimeter to infiltrate external flow onto the property and not put water into the backyards (ie. create a cut-off trench). These should be allowed and are different than the stormwater quantity control for internal stormwater management control. There will still be an easement but can be in the setback to minimize backyards. Chapter 6 – cutoff drains collecting offsite runoff…..would be the place to clarify language. Could it be addressed in the geotech report during design for final engineering design? Review the table on page 118 and potential add a clarifying note.

- ☐ **Proprietary BMPs** – we currently list items by name….. can we link to a DOE web page of acceptable BMPs instead of listing the two specific systems? This is an internal issue about what other structures will be allowed. County can review the language to have a separate list of approvable BMPs. Maintenance costs are a primary issue with acceptable of proprietary BMPs. Phosphorus control is also an issue as there are limited choices. There needs to be product availability to maintain in the long run. What is the process for accepting new BMPs as new projects? It would be helpful for the city and county to have comparable lists to be allowable BMPs to list on the web page. "Responsible Official could approve use of Ecology-approved BMP"….. Could use a variance which adds an extra step and is not the preferred method. County to review language.

Code update

Review of list of proposed changes. There are about 10 code sections and about 50 changes. Most are updated definitions, code references, and clarifications to use of LID. One new one that has not been discussed is the use of a cover over the exterior waste storage/containment area (Portland has a good detail).

Next steps and schedule – Public Process – public meetings

☐ We will send meeting schedule and meeting invites the group, as it becomes available.

Adoption target date – Adopt all documents with the BOCC by December 2015 and make effective by January 8, 2016.

Other

☐ Updates to figures to make more user friendly. Send any suggestions to Tim at Otak.